Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-8 are pending in the present application. In the March 4, 2004 Office Action, claims 1-6 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,285,494 to Sprecher et al. (hereinafter "*Sprecher*"). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,347,217 to Bengtsson et al. (hereinafter "*Bengtsson*"). The applicant has amended claims 1, 4, and 7, and added new claims 9-16. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present claims in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Sprecher*. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a computer-implemented method for maintaining cellular telecommunications site data. The method comprises, among other steps, accepting an identifier of a cellular telecommunications site, and in real time, determining the <u>current</u> cellular telecommunications site data corresponding to the site identified by the identifier from a <u>common database</u>. The current cellular telcommunications site data is provided to an output device.

According to an exemplary embodiment, a common database is provided for storing data from various entities such as people, groups and departments within a company. Without a common database, these entities maintain information relating to their specific business area in their own spreadsheets and databases. The common database consolidates the information from these various entities, allowing the information to be made available to users as well as various other computer software programs in real time, substantially instantaneously.

Sprecher fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of independent claim 1. In particular, *Sprecher* fails to teach "in real-time, determining the current cellular telecommunications site data corresponding to the cellular telecommunications site identified by the identifier from a common database; and providing the current cellular telecommunications site data to an output device" as recited by amended claim 1. *Sprecher* teaches the use of multiple databases. In addition to relational database 108, *Sprecher* teaches various modules

containing databases. For example, Figure 11 of *Sprecher* shows TMM database 242 and prediction and simulation database 248, as well as SQL database 336 shown in Figure 15.

Sprecher teaches allowing the user to configure the reporting format for generation of reports. A database field is provided to enable the user to choose the relevant database. See *Sprecher*, column 5, lines 32-34. If different, and possibly conflicting, information is stored in different databases, the user may not receive the real-time current information that he desires if he does not choose the correct database from which to generate the report. These multiple databases, in effect, inhibit the real-time determination of requested current cellular telecommunications site data. Without a common database, there is no way of knowing the data provided by the *Sprecher* teachings is current or real-time data. In fact, *Sprecher* teaches allowing a user to modify a cell site from a personal file and save to the personal file. *Sprecher*, column 10, lines 50-54. Doing so ensures that the changes made will not be seen by other users and thus, prevents the *Sprecher* system from "in real time, determining the current cellular telecommunications site data corresponding to the cellular telecommunications site identified by the identifier from a common database; and providing the current cellular telecommunications site data to an output device" as taught by amended independent claim 1. For at least these reasons, independent claim 1 is allowable over *Sprecher*.

Independent Claim 4

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Sprecher*. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The applicant has amended independent claim 4 in a manner similar to claim 1. *Sprecher* fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of amended independent claim 4. In particular, *Sprecher* does not teach "in real-time, determine the current cellular telecommunications site data corresponding to the cellular telecommunications site identified by the identifier from a common database; and provide the current cellular telecommunications site data to an output device" as recited by amended claim 4. Because *Sprecher* fails to teach these recitations for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, independent claim 4 is allowable over *Sprecher*.

Independent Claim 7

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Bengtsson*. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The applicant has amended independent claim 7 in a manner similar to claim 1. *Bengtsson* fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of amended independent claim 7. In particular, *Bengtsson* does not teach "in real-time, determine the current cellular telecommunications site data corresponding to the cellular telecommunications site identified by the identifier from a common database; and provide the current cellular telecommunications site data to an output device" as recited by amended claim 7.

Bengtsson teaches the graphical display of link quality information. The information is transmitted to the terminal for display from mobile switching centers (MSCs). Accordingly, *Bengtsson* does not teach determining current data "from a common database" as recited by claim 7. There are likely many MSCs that report the link quality data to the terminal for display according to the teachings of *Bengtsson*. Further, the data determined and provided by the teachings of *Bengtsson* is not "current" as recited by claim 7. The link quality data is displayed in graphical form, graphed over time periods. See *Bengtsson*, Figures 5a-5f, column 5, lines 61-65. Gathering past data from MSCs, performing statistical analysis on the data, and displaying the data as functions graphed over time is not equivalent to the real time determination of current data from a common database and providing the current data to an output device. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, independent claim 7 is allowable over *Bengtsson*.

Independent Claim 8

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Sprecher*. This rejection is respectfully traversed. *Sprecher* fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of independent claim 8. In particular, *Sprecher* does not teach "a plurality of tabs that provide access to different aspects of the cellular telecommunications network site data within a selected region field, wherein the plurality of tabs comprise a cell tab; and when the cell tab is selected, a plurality of location information is displayed to the user" as recited by claim 8. The March 4, 2004 Office Action cites Figure 7 of *Sprecher* as showing a plurality of tabs and Figure 8 as

showing a plurality of location information displayed as a result of selecting the cell tab. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Figure 7 of *Sprecher* does not show any tabs. It could not, therefore, show tabs that provide access to different aspects of site data within a selected region field. Additionally, Figure 8 of *Sprecher* is not displayed to a user as a result of his selecting a cell tab in Figure 7. Figure 8 is displayed to a user after a selection is made from the display main menu 174. See *Sprecher*, Figure 6. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, independent claim 8 is allowable over *Sprecher*.

Dependent Claims 2-3 and 5-6

Because *Sprecher* fails to teach, suggest, or describe the recitations of claims 2-3 and 5-6, and because claims 2-3 and 5-6 depend from allowable independent claims 1 and 4, respectively, dependent claims 2-3 and 5-6 are allowable over *Sprecher*.

New Claims 9-20

The applicant has added new claims 9-20. Support for new claims 9-16 may be found, for example, at pages 20-23 of the present application as well as in Figures 6-10. New claims 17-18 and 19-20 contain similar features as pending claims 2-3.

New claims 9-10, 11-12, 13-14 and 17-18, and 15-16 and 19-20 depend ultimately from claims 1, 4, 7, and 8, respectively, and are considered allowable for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application and allowance of the claims at an early date is solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this matter, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's undersigned attorney at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC

Date: June 1, 2004

By: Jodi L. Hartman
Reg. No. 55,251

Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
Telephone: 404.954.5100

23552
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE